



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

delphis, *Lipotes*, *Inia*, and *Platanista*, long-beaked river-dolphins. The combination of characters exhibited by at least three of these genera has made their classification a matter of much controversy. While at variance with the latest views of Abel and of True, there is much to commend the close association of the other genera named with *Platanista* instead of making a special family for them. True's final conclusion, however, was that *Stenodelphis* might best be included as a member of the Delphinidæ. (5) The Delphinidæ, which Winge believes to have branched off early in the Tertiary, from "primitive platanistids." The family is a somewhat heterogeneous assemblage, and its final constitution is still unsettled. (6) The Physteridæ, including the ziphioids as a subfamily, which are supposed by Winge to have "originated from the most primitive delphinids" during early Tertiary time, but as no members of the latter group are known before the Miocene, it is not clear what the ancestry would be like.

Although it must be confessed that the brief arguments for these "derivations" are not in all cases very convincing, yet the discussion brings out the fact of a general similarity in fundamental structure throughout the order, so that, although there is as yet no unanimity of opinion as to the precise relationships of many known genera, it does seem possible to perceive how some of the special peculiarities of various groups may have been evolved. An important section of the paper is contained in the second part—Notes,—which, besides brief discussion of controversial points, contains references to the more important literature on the order.

The translation has been done with care, even to the reproduction of the author's emendations (e.g., *Rhachionectes* for *Rhachianectes*, *Xiphius* for *Ziphius*, etc.), and with a view to giving "the author's ideas as clearly and exactly as possible rather than to make smooth English sentences." Much credit is due the translator for making this important summary now readily available in English.

—Glover M. Allen.

Osgood, Wilfred H. A MONOGRAPHIC STUDY OF THE AMERICAN MARSUPIAL, *CÆNOLESTES*. Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Zoöl. Ser., vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1-162; 22 plates. May, 1921.

The curious South American marsupial *Cænolestes* has been the subject of much discussion, and has been placed in three different suborders by various workers who have dealt with its systematic position. Osgood's extended descriptive account of its anatomy, and the conclusions based on his researches are, therefore, of great interest to all technical mammalogists.

The introductory sections include the general history of *Cænolestes* from its discovery in 1860 up to the present time, what little is known of its habits, and an account of its external characters. Following this, in the main body of the work, are detailed descriptions of the myology (pp. 22-61), urogenital system, alimentary canal, glands, respiratory and circulatory systems (pp. 61-77), skeleton and teeth (pp. 77-128). Additional chapters of special interest are: The origin or diprotodonty, relationships of *Wynyardia*, relationships of *Myrmecoboides*, phylogeny and taxonomy, and dispersal of marsupials. These all show the intensive study, clear reasoning, and fair presentation of the subject that we have learned to expect in the author's publications. A diagram of the phylogenetic

and taxonomic relationships of the principal groups of marsupials accompanies the discussion.

The essential points in Doctor Osgood's carefully prepared summary of his studies of *Cænolestes*, briefly stated, are: 1. *Cænolestes* is a surviving member of an ancient group and retains many primitive characters. 2. It has numerous resemblances to modern peramelids. 3. It has few non-marsupial characters and no great degree of specialization. 4. It has no especial affinity to the American Didelphiidæ. 5. The ancestor of the cænolestids was probably a northern form which had already separated from the generalized polyprotodont stock. 6. The North American ancestor of the cænolestids possibly extended throughout Holarctica and therefore may also have given rise to the Australian diprotodonts. 7. The phylogenetic and morphological relations of *Cænolestes* are best expressed by classifying it in the suborder Diprotodontia, family Palæothentidæ, subfamily Cænolestinæ.

The text closes with six pages on the brain of *Cænolestes obscurus*, by Dr. C. Judson Herrick, professor of neurology, University of Chicago. The figures in the plates are well executed (the line drawings of muscles and soft parts are credited to R. E. Snodgrass, a sufficient guarantee of accuracy), and each plate is faced by a lettered reference page so that, in using the work, it is unnecessary to search constantly for a special "explanation of plates." There is, unfortunately, no index.

—N. Hollister.

King, Helen Dean. A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE BIRTH MORTALITY IN THE ALBINO RAT AND IN MAN. *Anat. Record*, vol. 20, pp. 321-354. March 20, 1921.

A summary of the results of Doctor King's valuable experiments shows that during a period of 5 years in a total of 31,670 newborn albino rats 415, or 1.3 per cent, were stillborn. Under normal environmental conditions not more than 2 per cent of rat fetuses are dead at birth. Normal birth mortality in man is about 4 per cent. There are no data regarding percentage of stillbirths in other mammals. The normal sex ratio in newborn albino rats, including stillborn, is about 107 males to 100 females. The average in man is about 108 males to 100 females. Doctor King found an excess of males among stillborn in rats, the ratio being 129.3 males to 100 females. Sex ratio among stillborn children is about 130 to 140 boys to 100 girls. In the rat the percentage of stillbirths seems to vary somewhat with the seasons, being greatest in the autumn and least in the spring. It appears that malnutrition is directly responsible for most of the stillbirths.

—Hartley H. T. Jackson.

Johnston, T. B. THE ILEO-CAECAL REGION OF *CALLICEBUS PERSONATUS*, WITH SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE MORPHOLOGY OF THE MAMMALIAN CAECUM. *Journ. Anat.* (London), vol. 54, part I, pp. 66-78. 1919.

These studies are based chiefly on the Brazilian mammals *Callicebus personatus*, *Dasyppus sexcinctus*, *Tatusia novemcincta*, and *Cyclothurus didactylus*. In *Callicebus* the caecum is an actively functioning part of the alimentary canal. The paired lateral caeca of *Dasyppus sextinctus* and *D. villosus* are regarded as the